



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,973	12/05/2001	Paul R. Nash	41003.P086X	8414

25943 7590 03/23/2006

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/010,973	Applicant(s) NASH ET AL.	
	Examiner Hassan Phillips	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed December 30, 2005.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed December 30, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Walden merely teaches using "URL's to access help information", and fails to teach Applicant's claimed "determining based...on content of a locator of a first information page...whether to provide information browsing assistance for the first information page". Applicants further argue, the teachings of Kannan fail to remedy the deficiencies of Walden.

3. Regarding Applicant's arguments, Examiner agrees Walden teaches using URL's to access help information. Examiner further submits it is implicit in the teachings of Walden in accessing the help information a determination based on the content of the URL occurs in order to determine which, or what, help information is provided to a person wishing to access the help information. Furthermore, as indicated in previous actions Kannan teaches determining based at least in part on a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, whether to provide information browsing assistance, said locator identifying the first information page and a location from which the first information page is to be retrieved, and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination, (page 7, paragraph 91). Kannan further gives examples of providing

Art Unit: 2151

assistance to information browsing based at least in part on a locator of a first information page where Kannan teaches providing assistance to information browsing when a user switches back and forth between web pages, or is idle at a particular web page, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 14, paragraph 185). Although the teachings of Kannan strongly suggest that assistance is provided based on the "content" of a locator of a particular web page, such a teaching is not expressly stated. Thus, Examiner supplied the teachings of Walden to expressly show that browsing assistance can be provided based on the "content" of a locator. As acknowledged by Applicant in the remarks, retrieving information based on the content of a locator was well known in the art at the time of the invention, as this is the basic purpose of a URL. Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Kannan, as mentioned in previous actions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining whether to provide browsing assistance based on content of a locator. This would have advantageously facilitated providing browsing assistance to customers of a web site in a timely fashion, Walden col. 4, lines 9-14, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 25, page 14, paragraph 185.

4. Furthermore, as mentioned in previous actions, the Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims

Art Unit: 2151

implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 16-22, 25-27, 31-39, 42-44, 48-53, 56-58, 62-65, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0054064, in view of Walden et al. (hereinafter Walden), U.S. Patent 6,456,303.

7. In considering claims 1 and 19, Kannan teaches a method and apparatus comprising: determining based at least in part on a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system, whether to provide information browsing assistance for the first information page, said locator identifying

Art Unit: 2151

the first information page and a location from which the first information page is to be retrieved, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, paragraph 91, page 14, paragraph 185); and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, paragraph 91, page 14, paragraph 185).

Although the disclosed teachings of Kannan show substantial features of the claimed invention they fail to expressly disclose: determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Walden teaches a method and system for accessing online information comprising: using the content of a locator of an information page requested to be retrieved and displayed to provide information browsing assistance, (col. 4, lines 14-18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Kannan, given the teachings of Walden, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance. This would have advantageously facilitated providing browsing assistance to customers of a web site in a timely fashion, Walden col. 4, lines 9-14, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 25, page 14, paragraph 185.

8. In considering claims 2, 20, 36, and 51, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a uniform resource locator (URL). See page 7, paragraph 91.

9. In considering claims 3 and 21, Kannan teaches the determining comprising analyzing whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

10. In considering claims 4 and 22, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a URL, and the determining comprising analyzing whether the URL satisfies a URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

11. In considering claim 9, Kannan further teaches downloading the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system. See page 6, paragraph 74.

12. In considering claims 10 and 25, Kannan further teaches the information browsing assistance comprising displaying a second information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

13. In considering claims 11, 26, 43, and 57, Kannan teaches the second information page effectively replacing the first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

14. In considering claims 12, 27, 44, and 58, Kannan teaches a second information page additionally displayed complementing a first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

15. In considering claims 16 and 31, it is implicit in the teachings of Kannan that a request to retrieve and display the first information page is received, the request including the locator. See page 2, paragraph 22.

16. In considering claims 17, 32, 48, and 62, Kannan teaches in response to said receive of a request, notifying a monitor function of a browser helper of said receipt, (page. 2, paragraph 22); and said monitor function, in response to receipt of said notification, notifying an analyzer function of said browser helper, which performs said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance, (page 7, paragraphs 83-84).

17. In considering claims 18, 33, and 63, Kannan teaches executing the monitor function as an extension of a browser, and executing the analyzer function external to the browser. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

18. In considering claim 34, Kannan teaches the apparatus being a selected one of a wireless telephone, a palm sized personal digital assistant, a notebook computer, a desktop computer, and a set top box. See Fig. 1.

19. In considering claims 35 and 64, Kannan teaches a method and computer readable medium comprising: receiving a request from a client system for executable instructions designed to enable the client system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance based at least in part on a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, said location identifying said first information page and a location from which said first information page is to be retrieved; and in response, providing said client system with said requested executable instructions, (page 2, paragraph 22).

Although the disclosed teachings of Kannan show substantial features of the claimed invention they fail to expressly disclose: determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Walden teaches a method and system for accessing online information comprising: using the content of a locator of an information page requested to be retrieved and displayed to provide information browsing assistance, (col. 4, lines 14-18).

Thus, given the teachings of Walden, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance. This would have facilitated providing more timely help information to computer users, Walden col. 4, lines 9-14).

20. In considering claim 37, Kannan teaches performing a selected one of (a) enabling the client system to determine whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and (b) enabling the client system to provide said locator to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

21. In considering claim 38, Kannan teaches the server system being the same server system performing the receiving and the responsive providing. See Fig. 5A, and Fig. 6.

22. In considering claim 39, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a URL; and said executable instructions designed to perform a selected one of (a) enable the client system to determine whether said URL satisfies a URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and (b) enable the client system to provide said URL to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

23. In considering claim 42, Kannan further teaches either (a) said executable instructions designed to enable the client system to provide said information browsing assistance by displaying a second information page, or (b) the method further

comprising a server system providing said information browsing assistance to said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system.

See page 2, paragraph 25.

24. In considering claim 49, Kannan teaches either (a) said browser helper further includes said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance, in response to receipt of said notification, or (b) the method further includes a server having said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance for said client system, in response to receipt of said notification from said client system. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

25. In considering claims 50 and 65, Kannan teaches a server system and computer readable medium comprising: storage medium having stored therein at least a selected one of (a) first executable instructions designed to enable a first client system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to itself based at least in part on a first locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, and second executable instructions designed to provide the first client system with said first executable instructions in response to a request by the first client system for said first executable instructions, and (b) third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to a second client system based at least in part on a second locator of a second information page requested to be retrieved and displayed for said second client system, said first and

second locators identifying said first and second information pages, and a first and a second location from which said first and second information pages are to be retrieved respectively; and at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute at least one of said second and third executable instructions, (page 2, paragraph 22).

Although the disclosed teachings of Kannan show substantial features of the claimed invention they fail to expressly disclose: determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Walden teaches a method and system for accessing online information comprising: using the content of a locator of an information page requested to be retrieved and displayed to provide information browsing assistance, (col. 4, lines 14-18).

Thus, given the teachings of Walden, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance. This would have facilitated providing more timely help information to computer users, Walden col. 4, lines 9-14).

26. In considering claim 52, Kannan teaches said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to determine whether a first locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to determine for said second client

system whether a second locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

27. In considering claim 53, Kannan teaches said first and second locators comprising a first and second URL; said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to determine whether said first URL satisfies a first URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met; and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to determine for said second client system whether a second URL satisfies a second URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

28. In considering claim 56, Kannan further teaches said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to provide said information browsing assistance by displaying a second information page; and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to provide said information browsing assistance to said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system. See page 2, paragraph 25.

29. Claims 5-8, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, 55, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan and Walden, in view of Wolfe, U.S. Patent 6,397,246.

30. In considering claims 5, 23, 40, and 54, Kannan further discloses a URL based condition comprising a pattern of URLs visited specifying a history of visited URLs, (page 7, paragraphs 83-84); and, the analysis comprising matching a URL against URL history, (page 7, paragraph 91).

Although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: matching the URL against URL patterns.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Wolfe teaches a method and system for processing document requests in a network comprising: a URL based condition comprising a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, (col. 5, lines 21-31); and, an analysis means comprising matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns, (col. 5, lines 32-50).

Thus, given the teachings of Wolfe, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe in order to have each URL based condition comprise a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, and the analysis comprise matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns. Doing so would have provided an efficient means for providing assistance specifically tailored for the user depending on URL patterns entered by the user, Wolfe, col. 4, line 49 through col. 5, line 20, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

31. In considering claims 6, 24, 41, and 55, the teachings of Wolfe provide a means for each URL pattern to comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information to be provided, wherein matching comprises traversing the tree data structure. One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe to have each URL pattern comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided, and said matching comprise traversing said tree data structure, for the same reasons indicated in consideration of claims 5, 23, 40, and 54.

32. In considering claim 7, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for downloading the tree data structure from a server system onto the client system. See page 5, paragraph 65.

33. In considering claim 8, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for downloading the URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system. See page 5, paragraph 65.

34. Claims 13, 28, 45, 59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan and Walden, in view of Peercy et al. (hereinafter Peercy), U.S. Patent 5,960,429, (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).

35. In considering claims 13, 28, 45, and 59, although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: the second information page comprising a plurality of locators.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Peercy teaches: displaying a plurality of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from which the identified information pages are to be retrieved, (col. 1, lines 45-59).

Thus, given the teachings of Peercy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Peercy in order to have the second information page comprise a plurality of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from which the identified information pages of the second information page are to be retrieved. This would have provided an efficient means for giving the user a choice of popular information pages to choose from for browsing assistance, Peercy, col. 1, lines 35-41, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

36. Claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60, 61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan and Walden, in view of Blumenthal, U.S. Patent 6,026,409, (see Applicant IDS).

37. In considering claims 14, 29, 46, and 60, although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to

Art Unit: 2151

expressly disclose: modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Blumenthal teaches: modifying an environment attribute of a browsing environment, (col. 5, line 50 through col. 6, line 6).

Thus, given the teachings of Blumenthal, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Blumenthal in order to have the information browsing assistance comprise modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment within which the determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed. This would have provided an effective means for demarcating points of interest in the browsing environment that correspond to the information browsing assistance, Blumenthal, col. 5, lines 45-47, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

38. In considering claims 15, 30, 47, and 61, Blumenthal teaches one or more environment attributes comprising one or more of a display resolution attribute, a color resolution attribute, a font selection attribute, a media player preference attribute, an add-on selection attribute, and a plug-in selection attribute. See Blumenthal, col. 5, line 50 through col. 6, line 6. One of ordinary skill in the art would modify the teachings of Kannan with Blumenthal for the reasons indicated in consideration of claims 14, 29, 46, and 60.

Conclusion

39. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
3/16/06


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER